REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-13, 15-25, and 27-54 are pending in this application. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections

Claims 9-12, 21-24, and 33-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Breneman (US 5,974,135).

Breneman does not disclose or suggest "using ***both the identification information and account information specifically associated with the account of the second party*** to verify that the first party is entitled to access account data associated with the account of the second party; ... wherein the account information defines a right of the first party to access the account data and does not contain the authenticator of the second party," as required in amended claim 9. At most, Breneman discloses validating the agent's user ID and password against the agent identification information stored in a configuration database to determine which properties (e.g., ticketing, hotel, and casino) the agent is authorized to service based on the agent's access level. (col. 9, lines 37-43; col. 12, lines 27-42). Once the agent's user ID and password are validated, the agent has access to any and all customer data. No component of the Breneman system uses customer-specific account information to verify that the agent is entitled to access customer data associated with the account of that customer. For at least this reason, claim 9 is patentable.

Independent claims 21 and 33 are patentable for at least some of the reasons given with respect to claim 9.

Claims 1, 5-8, 13, 17-20, 25, 29-32, and 37-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Breneman in view of Pacifici et al. (US 6,230,171).

Claim 1, as amended, recites "without receiving the authenticator of the second party and ***without requiring the second party to access the account data at the same time***, enabling the first party to access the account data based on the account information, the enabling comprising displaying a Web page including information corresponding to the account data, the displayed Web page having an appearance that is substantially similar to an appearance of a Web page displayed when the second party accesses the account data."

The examiner correctly notes that Breneman does not disclose displaying to a first party a Web page "having an appearance that is substantially similar to an appearance of a Web page displayed when the second party accesses the account data" and relies on Pacifici for this feature. Pacifici discloses a system for supporting Web *co*-browsing of shared HTML documents. (Abstract). The techniques of Pacifici synchronize the views of all the participants of a Web co-browsing session to a ***single replicated consistent view***. (col. 4, lines 38-45; col. 9, lines 45-47). The objectives achieved by the Pacifici system dictate that at least two participants of the Web co-browsing session access a single HTML document at the same time in order for the Pacific system to be able to provide the at least two participants with a single replicated consistent view of the HTML document being accessed. Pacifici does not disclose and would not have made obvious "***without requiring the second party to access the account data at the same time***, enabling the first party to access the account data based on the account information, the enabling comprising displaying a Web page including information corresponding to the account data, the displayed Web page having an appearance that is substantially similar to an appearance of a Web page displayed when the second party accesses the account data" as recited in amended claim 1. For at least this reason, claim 1 is patentable.

Independent claims 13, 25, 40, 41, and 42 are patentable for at least some of the reasons given with respect to claim 1.

Claims 3-4, 15-16, and 27-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Breneman in view of Pacifici, and further in view of Sikorski, (Sikorskit, Robert, and Richard Peters, A Privacy Primer for the Web. JAMA. Vol. 279, No. 15, pp. 1219-1220; April 15, 1998).

Claims 44, 46-48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Breneman in view of Pacifici, and further in view of Star (US 2003/0216990).

Claim 45 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Breneman in view of Pacifici, and further in view of Trowbridge (Trowbridge, Dave. VARs Find Profit in Crime. Computer Technology Review. Los Angeles: Jul 1992. Vol. 12, Iss. 8; pg 1, 3 pgs.)

Claims 49, 52-54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Breneman in view of Star.

Claim 50 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Breneman in view of Pacifici.

Claim 51 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Breneman in view of Trowbridge (Trowbridge, Dave. VARs Find Profit in Crime. Computer Technology Review. Los Angeles: Jul 1992. Vol. 12, Iss. 8; pg 1, 3 pgs.)

All of the dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which they depend.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 1/3/06

Mandy Jubang
Reg. No. 45,884

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906